LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour. Editor, R. Palme Dutt.

NOTES OF THE MONTH —NO THIRD WORLD WAR
R.P.D.

WHAT IS RUSSIA AFTER?
Quæstor

SCIENCE AND THE WELFARE OF MANKIND *S. Lilley, M.Sc., Ph.D.*

THE FRENCH POLITICAL SCENE *Derek Kartun*

GERMAN WORKERS UNITE *J. Winternitz*

FOR A DEMOCRATIC B.B.C. *Peggie MacIver*

April 1946 . . . 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVIII, No. 4.

CONTENTS

April, 1946

	Page
Notes of the Month—No Third World War by R. P. D.	97
What is Russia After? by QUAESTOR	107
Science and the Welfare of Mankind by S. LILLEY, M.Sc., Ph.D.	111
German Workers Unite by J. WINTERNITZ	115
The French Political Scene by DEREK KARTUN	119
For a Democratic B.B.C. by PEGGIE MACIVER	124
Book Reviews—	
Coupland's Plan for India by K. S. SHELVANKAR	127
Another Welcome Revival by R. P. D.	128

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION

NAME..... ADDRESS.....
(*Please use Block Capitals*)

.....

.....

I am a regular reader of LABOUR MONTHLY and I wish to become a postal subscriber. I enclose $\frac{7/\text{- (Home)}}{8/\text{- (Abroad)}}$ to cover 12 months' subscription beginning with the .....issue.
(*Strike out the words which do not apply*).

Signed..... *Date*.....

BOUND VOLUMES, 1945.

We must advise our readers that no further loose copies can be accepted for binding. All volumes are now in the hands of the Bookbinders and will be despatched as soon as ready.

A limited number of volumes for past years will also be available.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

MUCH loose talk is being spread about a third world war. It is necessary to make a cool, objective and realistic appraisal of the present world situation, of the factors which are driving, whether consciously or unconsciously, towards a third world war, whether near or at a longer distance of time, and of the possibilities and conditions for preventing such a third world war. The slogan of World War III was originally let loose by Nazism in the closing stages of the recent war. It is openly looked forward to with hope by all Nazi and fascist elements, by the Franco Falange, Anders' Poles, Jugoslav Royalists and similar dispossessed reactionaries over Europe, who eagerly speculate on the supposed "inevitable" coming war between Anglo-America and the Soviet Union as the signal for a counter-revolutionary restoration. Such speculations have been encouraged by Churchill's Fulton speech, by many utterances in the British and American press, and by certain trends in foreign policy.

Witches' Chorus

At the same time we should not allow this cacophonous witches' chorus of socially decadent elements to lead to an exaggerated conception of their power or to create a kind of neurotic hypnosis of the supposed inevitability of the third world war. These speculators forget that wars have to be fought by armies and sustained by munitions, and that the British workers will not be so easily drawn into their facile plans to fight or make munitions against the Soviet Union. The power of the democratic forces of the world after victory over fascism is amply sufficient to prevent a third world war, provided a correct policy is followed. The overwhelming mass of mankind view with horror the prospect of a third world war. Such instinctive repulsion, however, and subjective wish is not alone sufficient, as past experience has shown, unless it is translated into positive united action based on a clear political understanding of the indispensable conditions for maintaining unity, defeating the reactionary warmongers and preventing war in the present period of world history. It is our present decisions and actions in 1946, in the first formative year after the conclusion of the war and the defeat of fascism, especially with regard to the relations of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, that will govern the future for many years.

Lenin on a Third World War

Lenin long ago pointed out, during the first world war, at a time when the myth of "the war to end war" and "permanent peace" within capitalism was widespread, that, if mankind did not learn the lesson from the first world war, then a second world war would follow and if the lesson should still not be learned, then a third world war would follow: This remains absolutely true. It is absolutely true, and an elementary law, that the conditions of capitalism and imperialism, the insoluble contradictions of capitalism and imperialism inevitably breed war, and that any dream of permanent peace within capitalism, no matter by what machinery, is a dangerous and demoralising delusion. But Lenin was not thereby preaching a fatalistic doctrine of the inevitability of a series of world wars. On the contrary, he was pointing the path forward for the struggle of the working-class and the peoples against imperialist war and against imperialism. Marxism has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always taught that the strength of the working-class and the peoples can check a particular menace of war, and by such success can be the stronger to check a further menace of war, and can in this struggle and by the time thus gained advance in strength to its final goal of ending capitalism and imperialism, which will alone finally remove the causes of war.

From the First to the Second World War

Before 1914 the old Socialist International sought to organise the working-class to prevent the first world war—with the most implicit clearness in the Basel Manifesto of 1912, which outlined in concrete detail the character of the impending war and the revolutionary consequences that would flow from it. There was not yet the necessary strength, unity and leadership to prevent the first world war. But the revolutionary consequences of the first world war were such that by the time of the approach of the second world war the conditions were vastly altered. It is universally recognised that the second world war could have been almost easily prevented. Had the policy of the Soviet Union and of the working-class and democratic forces in Western Europe for a combined Peace Front of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union been carried out, the second world war need never have taken place. This policy only just failed, owing to the role of the Munichites and the assistance given them by Western Social Democracy in opposing working-class unity and the popular front.

New Balance of Forces

Today the balance of forces is still further changed, with the defeat of fascism, the increased world strength of the Soviet Union, the advance of working-class strength and organisation and of working-class unity, the new democratic governments in Europe, the progress of the colonial peoples towards independence and the organisation of the United Nations partially reflecting the new balance of forces. Thus the conditions are enormously more favourable for preventing the third world war. But in approaching this task, it is necessary to study very closely the experience of the concrete conditions leading to the second world war, in order not to repeat old errors, and in order to carry forward our policy in relation to the new conditions today.

Lesson of History

Why was the first world war followed by the second? The general answer is sufficiently manifest in the conditions of imperialism, the intensified economic contradictions between the advance of productive power and the monopolist restrictions which found expression in the world economic crisis, and the sharpening conflict for the new division of the world, which found specific expression in the challenge of the expanding imperialist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, against the possessing colonial powers. All this reflected the normal conflict of imperialism developing to war, and reproduced the pattern of the first imperialist world war at a higher stage. But there entered a new element into the second world war, and this new element was decisive for its character. This new element corresponded to the new period of world history which had opened with the general crisis of capitalism, the first victory of the socialist revolution and establishment of socialism in Russia, the advance of the working-class in conditions of growing social crisis and the desperate counter-offensive of the ruling class through fascism to destroy the working-class movement, democracy and the Soviet Union. And it was this new element which governed the historical process of events leading to the second world

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war and dominated its decisive character.

War of Liberation

Thus the second world war differed decisively from the first world war in that, interpenetrating and dominating the familiar pattern of inter-imperialist conflict, the second world war developed from the outset as a war of liberation of the peoples, in unity with the Soviet Union, against fascism. This dominating character of the second world war was visible from the outset, from the earliest stages, from the war of the Chinese people against Japanese fascism, from the war of the Abyssinian people against Italian fascism and from the war of the Spanish Republic, supported by the International Brigade and the Soviet Union, against German and Japanese fascism.

Imperialist War and Anti-Fascist War

All the counteracting efforts and policies of the imperialists could not defeat this decisive anti-fascist character of the war. Neither the policies of backing Japan and building up German fascism and its rearmament, nor Munich and its attempted bloc of Western imperialism with German and Italian fascism against the Soviet Union, nor the imperialist phase of the war launched by Chamberlain and Daladier, with the main weight directed against Communism and the Soviet Union, and with the "phony war" in relation to Hitler, could turn aside the current of history. These policies led to deadly consequences for the peoples of Britain, France and Europe. But these consequences led in turn to the necessity of the acceptance of the previously rejected British-Soviet alliance and the final establishment of the world alliance of the United Nations which led to the military downfall of fascism. It is the fruits and the gains from this victory in the war of liberation against fascism which now need to be maintained and extended, and no reversion permitted to the old fatal policies which led to the second world war.

Fatal Anti-Soviet Frenzy

The lessons of the fatal suicidal policies which led to the second world war need to be learned, remembered, driven home and acted upon today, if we are to prevent the third world war. Why did the victorious powers of the first world war, after defeating Germany, destroying its navy, air force, artillery and tanks, imposing the Versailles Treaty on Germany, and prohibiting its rearmament, proceed at once to rebuild the power of German militarism, tear up the clauses of Versailles, permit and even assist its rearmament until within twenty years German imperialism could threaten the world anew with an even more formidable armed power than in 1914? The answer is known to every one today. It was the anti-Soviet hostility of the Western Powers, the fear of Communism and popular revolutions, the division of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union which provided the basis for the revival of German militarism and imperialism, smoothed the path for fascist aggression, wrecked the League and brought on the second world war. It was the "Anti-Comintern" banner which provided the grand shibboleth and Open Sesame for the fascist bandits to cover up their aggression, lull, disorganise, bully and blackmail the Western imperialists, and let loose the second world war. Behind the "Anti-Comintern" banner gathered all the battalions of infamy and aggression. Would it be believed that voices could be heard today, after all these years of slaughter, endeavouring to raise this shameful banner anew?

The Poisoned Cup

Why die twice of the same poison? In the ordeal of war the fatal error of British ruling class policy during the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inter-war years, under the deadly lure of the anti-Bolshevik bait, had to be recognised, not merely by critics, but by the official representatives of the ruling class. The Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, R. K. Law, stated in Parliament in January, 1943:—

During the twenty years between the last war and this, Germany played upon the fear of Bolshevism. That was why she was able to get away with murder for so long.

And *The Times* wrote in an editorial in August, 1943:—

It has often been remarked that the survival of German militarism through the catastrophe of 1918 was one of the essential foundations on which Hitler built. But it is less often recalled that the Allies, by their reluctance to tolerate revolutionary movements in Germany in the winter of 1918-19, unwittingly connived at its survival, and that cunning propaganda of "the fear of Bolshevism" was the force which impelled them to this connivance.

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be." With the maniac cries of Hitler proclaiming the Communist Parties of the world the menace to civilisation and world peace still ringing in our ears, with the blood of the victims still soaking the earth, within nine months of the end of the war, the mantle of Goebbels is assumed by the victors, and we find a Churchill proclaiming that "the Communist Parties constitute a growing peril and challenge to Christian civilisation" or a Bevin announcing to Uno that "the danger to the peace of the world" arises from "the Communist Parties in every country." Where that path leads, history has shown.

"Worse than Munich"

Cardinal Griffin, in a recent address at Westminster Cathedral, solemnly proclaims that the present world situation is "worse than Munich"; "world affairs are in a more perilous position than before Munich." He and his kidney may well find it "worse than Munich." No longer the cosy agreement with Hitler and Mussolini, and hopes of the grand anti-Soviet crusade. Hitler and Mussolini in the dust; the Soviet Union stronger than ever; and the peoples of Europe rising to clear out the pro-fascist scum and take possession. No wonder he and his company lament. But this is not exactly what he intended to convey. He, and a thousand propagandists like him, including on the B.B.C., are trying to turn the shameful memories of "Munich" and "appeasement" inside out, and to suggest that a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union is "Munich" and agreement with the Soviet Union is "appeasement." This is double-dealing with a vengeance. The essence of Munich and appeasement was the policy of hostility to the Soviet Union and support of fascism. And now these double-dealers try to utilise the popular fury against the memories of Munich and appeasement in order to repeat the same policies of hostility to the Soviet Union and support of pro-fascism. Such transparent double-dealing will take in few.

Stalin's Warning

In the spring of 1939 Stalin gave warning of where this line of policy of the Western imperialists was leading, and his words are worth recalling, when attempts are being made to revive the same basic line in new conditions today. Speaking to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., he said:—

It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialist war that it has not yet become universal, a world war. The war is being waged by aggressor States, who in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive States, primarily England, France and the U.S.A., while the latter draw back and retreat, making concession after concession to the aggressors.

To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialist war?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He answered by explaining the significance of the policy of "non-intervention":—

The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work: not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply in the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear of course "in the interests of peace," and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents."

He concluded with the famous warning that "the big and dangerous game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in a serious fiasco for them." This analysis is worth bearing in mind today, when certain similar tendencies are revealing themselves anew in altered conditions; for this analysis throws a sharp light on the role of the most reactionary sections of the Western imperialists in the second world war and today.

Western Imperialism and Anti-Fascism

When the British ruling class found themselves faced with the fiasco which Stalin had predicted, with the consequent domination of the Continent of Europe by Hitler, and their own peril, they accepted in the moment of opportunity the policy of the British-Soviet Alliance which they had previously rejected, and which proved the turning point of the war and the cornerstone of final victory over Hitler. The credit for this historic decision, which corresponded to the deepest interests of the British people, rests with Churchill. But this did not mean that Churchill (as he was himself at pains to make clear) or the British ruling class had changed their attitude to the Soviet Union and to Communism, or were fighting the war with the same anti-fascist conception which inspired the peoples.

Double Strategy

British imperialism pursued a double objective in the war, which was thinly concealed in official expression, but which was patently visible, not only in unofficial expression, but in the practical strategy of the war and in the accompanying Anglo-American diplomatic conferences. On the one hand, the Western imperialists sought, in alliance with the Soviet Union, to ensure the defeat of Hitler. On the other hand, they were concerned that the downfall of fascism should not lead to the advance of Communism or popular anti-fascist revolutions in Europe endangering the old social order, or the strengthening of the Soviet Union. They calculated that the weight of the war would not only destroy Hitler, but either equally destroy or fatally weaken the Soviet Union, and that the Anglo-American forces would emerge as the main victors to police Europe and control the world.

A Minister's Indiscretion

This double strategy of Western imperialism in the war, which becomes of exceptional importance to analyse and recall today in the light of fuller facts now known, for the direct bearing that it has on present reactionary tendencies which have now come into the open, was exposed at the time in the LABOUR MONTHLY in October, 1941, in dealing with reactionary tendencies in ruling class policy:—

Seeking to hold the British forces immune and inactive during the critical time when their action could most decisively help the common cause, they openly calculate on intervening fresh, and at the peak of production, later, when both combatants in the East are exhausted, and thus ensuring the Anglo-American domination of Europe and preservation of the old order after the collapse of fascism. Such becomes the New Munichism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This calculation received naive and open expression in the famous indiscretion of the Government Minister, Moore-Brabazon, when at a private meeting on July 31, 1941, speaking on an occasion when he declared he was "glad there were no reporters present," he expressed, according to the unchallenged summary of the chairman of the A.E.U. at the Trades Union Congress, the

hope that the Russian and German armies will exterminate each other, and while this is taking place, we, the British Commonwealth of Nations, will so develop our Air Force and other armed forces that, if Russia and Germany do destroy each other, we shall have the dominating power in Europe.

The innocent Moore-Brabazon was only giving away the calculations of higher authorities. When the revelation was made, which cost him his seat in the Cabinet, official indignation was turned against those guilty of reporting a private meeting, and it was explained in mitigation that the Minister had been speaking without notes and only thinking aloud. As Gallacher said:—

The Minister of Aircraft Production has given an explanation of his speech: it was extempore; he had not been thinking of what he was saying. But because he was not thinking of what he was saying, his inmost thoughts came out.

" Onward, Christian Soldiers "

This double policy found practical expression in the strategy of the war. The strategy of the war was so conducted that the main brunt should fall upon the Soviet Union. It had originally been anticipated in all government circles that the Nazi offensive would wipe out the Soviet Union in a matter of weeks, or at most a few months. While the most terriffic military onslaught in history was let loose on the Red Army, no British army was in action on any front. Churchill and Roosevelt met in mid-Atlantic and attended divine service with the appropriately chosen hymn, "Onward, Christian Soldiers" (while the Soviet and Chinese soldiers were battling against odds, only the Christian soldiers were not engaged) "Onward, Christian Soldiers, marching as to war" (the operative words being "*as to war*").

Second Front Postponement

When the Soviet Union, against all Western official expectation, withstood the onslaught ("unlooked for, undreamt of," as Churchill said), when the first Soviet counter-offensive was launched in the spring of 1942 with the expectation of parallel action in the West, when Molotov came to London to demand parallel action in the West, the official pledge was given of the Second Front in the West in 1942. That pledge was dishonoured and subsequently explained to have been a bluff. For three years from the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union, when all the pundits began with one accord to write about Hitler's fatal error in incurring the two-front war in Europe, the Second Front in the West was postponed and delayed until June, 1944. For three years the Soviet armies had to meet alone the main weight of the Nazi armies.

Churchill's Responsibility

All the babblers and sycophants of official expression poured scorn upon the Communist campaign for the Second Front in the West and jeered at the "armchair strategists" who dared to intervene on matters of strategy when it was obvious that the military experts alone could judge and knew what was best. Those babblers look foolish enough today, when it has been revealed in the memoirs of Captain Butcher, the aide-de-camp of General Eisenhower, that General Eisenhower and his military experts favoured the Second Front in Europe in the summer of 1942, that the oppo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sition came primarily, not from military, but from political sources, and that the decisive opposition which blocked and delayed the Second Front came—what could not be stated at the time—from Churchill. When Churchill's decision to ban the Second Front in 1942 was conveyed to General Eisenhower, General Eisenhower called it "the blackest day of the war."

West and East

That decision prolonged the war. As General Sir Gifford Martel has since written in his book, *Our Armoured Forces:*—

The troops in England were ready a year before they were used, and were even becoming stale by 1944. Could we not have been ready sooner if we had settled on our main plan at an earlier date?

It threw upon the Soviet Union the main weight of the war, to confront alone for three years three-fourths of the Nazi forces, and at terrible cost to tear those forces to pieces before the Anglo-American forces intervened in the West at the last hour to share in the victory. The cost was revealed in the grim figures of war losses. The Soviet Union lost seven million dead. The total of Anglo-American losses has been compared by noble speakers in the House of Lords on traffic problems to peacetime road casualties.

Quebec Plans

The same twofold policy was revealed in the diplomatic conduct of the war. The Anglo-American diplomatic conferences preceded and were conducted apart from the meetings of the representatives of the three powers, and, as the war progressed, were more and more obviously preoccupied with post-war questions of maintaining the old order in Europe after the downfall of fascism. It is an ironic sidelight on the Canadian espionage trials that the greatest alarm is expressed because it is alleged that the secret talks and plans of Churchill and Roosevelt at Quebec in 1943 and 1944 may have become known to Stalin:—

Interest in the Canadian spy-ring disclosures centred today on the realisation that details of the secret Churchill-Roosevent discussions at the Quebec Conferences could have been transmitted to Moscow, owing to the leakages at Ottawa.

Officials are perturbed when they recall that the first Quebec Conference in 1943 included delicate discussions on Second Front pressure from Marshal Stalin.

The second conference in 1944 . . . dealt with post-war plans to assure democracy in the Western style in liberated Europe.

—*Daily Telegraph*, 6th March, 1946.

It will be recalled that it was at the second Quebec Conference, as Churchill subsequently revealed, that the decision was reached to intervene in Greece after the departure of the Germans in order to overthrow the National Liberation Movement.

Crimea and After

When in the later stages of the war the unbreakable strength of the Soviet Union stood revealed to all, it was recognised that a shift would have to be made in policy, that the original calculations of a wrecked and prostrate Soviet Union at the end of the war had miscarried, that it was inexorably necessary to recognise the full status of the Soviet Union as an equal world power after the war and that a basis of Three Power collaboration would have to be maintained as the foundation of the post-war settlement. This found expression in the pledges of the Moscow, Teheran and Crimea Agreements for the Three Powers "to work together in war and in the peace that would follow," "to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible," and "to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism." These pledges and the accompanying concrete agreements of Moscow, Crimea and Potsdam laid down the plain and indispensable path

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for post-war peace and democratic settlement.

Dishonoured Pledges

It is the violation and even repudiation of these pledges by the Western Powers, once the danger of war has passed, that underlies all the present difficulties. The Teheran and Crimea Agreements, solemnly signed on behalf of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, had laid down the basis of Three Power collaboration and leadership in the post-war world as the indispensable foundation of peace and condition of success of the United Nations, the only alternative to which would mean the renewal of rivalries and antagonism, two-Power combinations against a third, and all the instability of balance-of-power politics. Yet official British, and to a certain extent American Government declarations today shamelessly repudiate the basis of Three-Power politics. Thus Noel-Baker declared on behalf of the Government in the House of Commons on February 20:—

> The Government did not agree that we could get peace and co-operation between ourselves and Russia by withdrawing important questions out of the framework of the United Nations Organisation and by going back to Three-Power politics.

The same violation could be traced in detail in relation to the operation of the Potsdam Agreement and the pledge to "destroy the vestiges of Nazism and Fascism." It is this, and not any imaginary shift of policy of the Soviet Union, which has remained loyal to the Crimea and Potsdam Agreements, that is responsible for the present difficulties.

Atom Bomb Megalomania

What led to this dangerous reversion of Anglo-American policy at the end of the war from the Three-Power basis to the old plans for Anglo-American domination and anti-Soviet manoeuvring? The evidence tends to indicate that the decisive shift came with the atom bomb, and the illusions of grandeur to which the new weapon gave rise in the heads of the Anglo-American strategists and reactionary statesmen that the monopolist possession of this weapon changed the entire balance of world forces and made possible the renewal of the plans for Anglo-American world domination against the Soviet Union and the rising democratic forces. As Churchill declared in his report to the House of Commons on August 16:—

> The decision to use the atomic bomb was taken by President Truman and myself at Potsdam. . . . From that moment our outlook on the future was transformed.

Anglo-American Power Politics

The decision to maintain monopolist possession of the atom bomb broke the basis of strategic collaboration and confidence, and was accompanied by the launching of a wholesale anti-Soviet propaganda offensive. As the *Observer* declared on August 12, 1945:—

> The declaration that Britain and the United States will not reveal the secret of the atom bomb until means have been found to control the bomb is reassuring. But it means a great change in world-power relations. . . . It binds Britain and America together as never before. . . . It shifts the balance of power among the Big Three. . . . The possession of the monopoly of the atom bomb makes American-British power preponderance for the time being a fact.

Such was the heady wine of strategic illusion which led to the renewal of the dreams of Anglo-American world domination and found reflection in the present worsening of the international situation. It was not until the anti-Soviet propaganda campaign from the West, launched since the summer of 1945, had reached extreme heights, that the Soviet Union abandoned its policy of loyal silence in public on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the actions of its Western allies and began to reply in public on behalf of the democratic anti-fascist forces of the world.

Goebbels' Testament

At this point it is worth recalling the final speeches which Goebbels was making on behalf of Nazism only a year ago, on the eve of the Nazi collapse. Goebbels described how Europe and Germany would be divided between the Anglo-American and Soviet forces. He painted a picture of how Eastern Europe would be organised by the Soviet Union behind an "iron curtain" (it is worth recalling that that phrase, the "iron curtain," was first coined by Goebbels, which is so eagerly repeated today by all the Western reactionary publicists, including Churchill). He prophesied how this would lead to inevitable future conflict between the Anglo-American Powers and the Soviet Union in World War III. On this basis he foresaw the return of Nazism. This indication of Nazi post-war strategy is all-important to bear in mind today, if we are to understand the true significance of the reactionary campaign which is being conducted with such fidelity along the lines laid down by Nazi strategy in so many countries today. This tendency already began to reveal itself in the shady episodes which made such a ragged and even disparate ending of the war in Europe, with the wholesale surrender of German armies without a struggle in the West alongside desperate fighting in the East, the affair of the Doenitz Government, the prolonged recognition of German Wehrmacht formations in defiance of Potsdam, etc.

Churchill's Speech

It is against this background that we need to see the significance of Churchill's speech at Fulton and his continuing campaign. The fallen crime-soaked mantle of the Anti-Comintern Pact is picked up to be worn on new shoulders. The cracked clarion-call of the "crusade of Christian civilisation" against the "menace" of Communism and Soviet "expansion" is proclaimed from new lips. The time-worn spectre of Hitler and Ribbentrop and Goebbels, which had already done duty for so many years to cover every rascally and criminal project of world aggression, walks again; and Goebbels' sneering ghost may rub his hands over his new convert.

Gambler's Last Throw

It is not difficult to understand the fury behind this last desperate crusade of the beaten Churchill, whose original attempts to crush in blood the infant Soviet Republic ended in a costly and inglorious fiasco, and whose pre-war eulogies of Japanese expansion, of Mussolini, of Hitler and of Franco helped to pave the way for the war. The post-war world has not turned out as he intended. The Soviet Union is not prostrate and submissive, begging for favours from the Anglo-American lords of the earth, but, despite all the terrible losses, striding forward along the path of reconstruction, and more bold and strong and confident in policy than ever, while it is British and American capitalism that are more and more clearly faced with gigantic economic problems. Europe has not obeyed the dictation of Anglo-American finance; even France, thanks to Communism, is eluding the snare of the Western bloc. The reactionary protégés are gone or going: Mihailovich, Badoglio, Darlan, Peter, Victor Emanuel, Leopold—where are they now? Churchill himself has been rejected by the British people; and alone of the three war leaders, Stalin continues stronger than ever in the confidence of a united people. So the defeated gambler calls for the last stand—the military coalition of Anglo-American reaction (Europe is already despaired of as lost) against the world:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

200 millions against 1,800 millions, with the one hope the devil's lure of the atom bomb.

Britain's Choice

The choice before the British people is plain. It is not surprising that Churchill and Tory reaction should embark upon this reckless defeatist adventurist course; their bolt is shot; their star is setting. But it is a matter for serious concern that a Labour Foreign Secretary should by his own actions and speeches have helped to pave the way for Churchill's speech, and, while formally dissassociating himself from the responsibility for the speech, should do nothing to repudiate the policy set forward in the speech and blazoned to the world (especially to German Nazism, where the effect of the repeated B.B.C. broadcasts of the speech to Germany is stated to have been electric) with all the devices of British official publicity, and should in his own concrete policy so closely approximate to the many of the main lines of Churchill. This is a state of affairs which needs to be put right; for the whole future of the British people and of the British labour movement is involved in this basic issue of foreign policy. We welcome the action of the 105 Labour M.P.s who have shown their understanding of the importance of this issue and the necessity for a public and practical repudiation of Churchill's policy and turn to a democratic foreign policy.

Either—Or

The choice before the British people is clear. Either forward with the advance of the progressive peoples of the world, with the Soviet Union, the new democracies in Europe, the colonial peoples, world trade unionism and working-class unity. Or back to enslavement to American finance-capital and its British reactionary partners. The voice of Churchill is the voice of the most reactionary sections of Anglo-American finance, which fear the advance of the peoples and socialism over the world. His crusade is not merely directed against Communism and the Soviet Union, any more than was the crusade of Hitler, which used the same public device. It is directed not least against the advance of the labour movement and socialism in Britain. His policy is not merely anti-Soviet. It is anti-British. His policy would make Britain the pawn of the American millionaires, their strategic outpost against a socialist world, the cockpit and the victim of the planned third world war.

Our Path

In vain Churchill speaks of "fifth columns," and seeks to conceal the fact that the Fifth Column is the classic engine of fascism. The British people want no Wall Street Fifth Column here. Their patriotism rises against enslavement to the American billionaires for the benefit of the reactionary moneybags here. They seek the path of friendship and firm unity with the Soviet Union and all the progressive peoples of the world, to maintain peace, while they advance on the long overdue tasks of social change in Britain. That is the path which will defeat the reactionary plans for a third world war. And the first indispensable step along this path is the change-over to a democratic foreign policy and the establishment of working-class unity in Britain.

R. P. D.

March 20, 1946.

NOTE ON "INDIA AND PAKISTAN"

In the article on "India and Pakistan" in last month's issue, reference was made to the results of the Sind provincial elections as reported in the first telegraphic messages published in the press here. The completed reports now available show that the Moslem League won 27 of the 35 Moslem seats, the Syed group 4, and the Nationalist Moslems 4; the Congress won 22 seats and the Europeans 3. A Moslem League Ministry has been formed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is Russia After ?

by QUAESTOR

ONE of the methods of maintaining ignorance of the U.S.S.R. and fostering hostility to its policy, most widely practised by the capitalist press of this country before 1939, was to ignore or mutilate important statements by Soviet leaders. It was this practice, among others, that millions of British people had in mind, during the first twelve months after Hitler attacked the U.S.S.R. in June, 1941, when they said with indignation: "We've been told lies about Russia!" or "Why didn't they tell us the truth?"

Stalin's speeches suffered particularly from this habit of our free and independent press. An example was the treatment of his speech of March, 1939, with its penetrating analysis of the war danger, its offer of an alliance with peaceloving countries to prevent war and its warning that, if war broke out because such an alliance were rejected, the U.S.S.R. would not pull the chestnuts out of the fire for others. Coming on the eve of Hitler's march into Prague, it interfered with hopes of yet another Munich—this time at Russia's expense; so it was almost completely suppressed.

During the war, when the crisis was past, i.e., after the Red Army had gone over to its giant offensive at Stalingrad in November, 1942, the same tendencies began to show themselves. Practically all references, in Stalin's speech of November 6, 1943, to the Socialist character of the Soviet social order were deleted by the agencies and newspapers; and the speech of a year later was handled in the same way. Since the end of the war, of course, the mutilation or non-publication of important Soviet statements (particularly in the newspapers with a mass circulation) has become a commonplace. This was essential if babble about the "mystery" or "uncertainty" of Soviet intentions and policy were to have any effect.

Thus it came about that Stalin's election speech of February 9 this year was so mutilated as to make it possible for both the B.B.C. and the *Daily Herald* to suggest afterwards (through the mouths of convenient "American commentators") that Stalin was putting guns before butter, and that this had greatly increased international suspicions. Thus again it came about that the majority of the capitalist newspapers—including that owned by Messrs. Odhams—failed to notice Stalin's Order of the Day on the Red Army Anniversary (February 23). Similarly Molotov's election speech of February 6 was treated as of very little consequence by the same newspapers. Yet all three documents are of first-class importance for anyone who really wants to understand Soviet policy.

No doubt one of the reasons which prompted the mutilation of Stalin's speech was that it finally disposed of the myth that, if the U.S.S.R. had made stupendous sacrifices in lives and property owing to the postponement of the Second Front, first to 1943 and then to 1944 (against the wishes of the Americans), the Allies nevertheless made it up to the Russians in war materials, without which the Red Army would have been defeated. Stalin's figures of Soviet production for the three years (summer, 1942-summer, 1945) need to be compared with those of Lease-Lend imports for the three years, 1941-1944 (very little in the first year) from the United States, Great Britain and Canada, which were published in Moscow on June 11, 1944:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Lease-Lend Imports Aug. 1941-June 1944	*Soviet Output June 1942-45*
Tanks	 9,214	90,000
Planes	 12,258	120,000
Guns	.... 31,265*	360,000
Shells (million)	.... 40.2 (1944 alone)	240
Cartridges (million)	.... 1,316.2 (1944 alone)	7,400

No doubt another reason for the maltreatment of Stalin's speech in the news-columns of the British press, after the treatment of his speeches of 1943 and 1944, can be safely put down to his statements: "The war has shown that the Soviet social system is a truly popular system, which has grown from the people and enjoys its powerful support . . . . The Soviet social system is a better form of organisation of society than any non-Soviet social system. . . . The Soviet State system has proved to be a model of the multinational state . . . in which the national problem and the problem of co-operation among nations have been solved better than in any other multinational State." At a time when the degree of democracy (won for the people by organised Labour) in capitalist countries like Britain and the U.S.A.; and the regimes maintained in India, Burma, Cyprus, etc.; are loudly advertised as the highest pinnacle of democratic achievement, any other claim is best shoved out of sight and hearing.

Yet a third reason might be Stalin's reminder of the economic basis on which in 13 years (1928-1941) the U.S.S.R. made itself capable of victory —the nationalisation of industry and banking, and the development of collective farming (on the basis itself of the nationalisation of the land in 1917) for Soviet nationalisation *without* compensation left no economic power in the hands of the capitalists at all, and in fact abolished them as a class. It was on this foundation that the remarkable growth of output mentioned in the March *Notes of the Month* took place. Whereas the small instalment of nationalisation *with* compensation which the Labour Government has undertaken to carry out, in order to pull British industry out of the ruin threatening it from capitalist anarchy still leaves the capitalist class very much in existence, by transferring ownership in the last analysis from one of its groups to the class as a whole.

But no doubt the basic reason was that Stalin's main outline of the plans of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. left no excuse for the pretence that Soviet policy is "mysterious," still less that it is "expansionist," "aggressive" or even "imperialist." Stalin said those plans were set forth in the new Five-Year Plan (1946-1950) shortly to be adopted, and continued:

> The main tasks of the new Five-Year Plan are to restore the afflicted districts of the country, to restore industry and agriculture to their pre-war level, and then to exceed this level to a more or less considerable degree.
>
> Not to mention the fact that the ration card system will be abolished in the near future, special attention will be given to the extension of production of consumer goods, to raising the standard of living of the working people by means of the steady reduction of the prices of all commodities and to the progressive construction of scientific research institutes of all kinds, which will enable science to deploy its forces.
>
> I do not doubt that, if we render proper assistance to our scientists, they will be able not only to come level with, but even in the near future to surpass the achievements of science beyond the boundaries of our country.
>
> As to plans for a longer period, our party intends to organise a new powerful upsurge of the national economy which would enable us, for instance, to raise the level of our industry threefold as compared with the pre-war level. We must achieve a situation wherein our industry is able to produce annually up to 50 million tons of pig iron, up to 60 million tons

* Anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns only.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of steel, up to 500 million tons of coal, up to 60 million tons of oil. Only under such conditions can we regard our country as guaranteed against any accidents. This will require perhaps three new Five-Year Plans, if not more. But this task can be accomplished, and we must accomplish it.

What could be plainer, clearer and more emphatic and reassuring in its peaceful perspective than this statement? It begins by referring to the grim and paramount reality of life in the Soviet Union—that stupendous devastation which the smug leader writers and diplomatic correspondents conveniently forget. The 1,700 towns wrecked, the 70,000 villages burned to ashes, the 6 million buildings demolished, including nearly 32,000 factories, mines, power stations, etc., the 40,000 miles of railway track destroyed, the 40,000 hospitals, 43,000 public libraries and 84,000 educational establishments of all kinds sacked and ruined, the 24 million horses and cattle, the 47 million pigs, sheep and goats slaughtered or carried off—these are the figures which dictate the chief concern of the U.S.S.R. for many a year.

And then—stretching over a space of fifteen years or more—an immense programme of further development, aiming primarily at a great rise in the standard of living. Of course, that means a great increase in the output of the heavy industries, sufficient, as Molotov pointed out in his speech, to bring up the output *per head of the population* to the level of the most developed capitalist countries; but it also requires special attention to the output of consumer goods and to lowering prices. It also requires special efforts to make available the resources of science. For this purpose the Socialist State has advantages, Molotov pointed out:—

We have not had and will not have, crises in which industry falls into a slump, as is characteristic of capitalist countries. We have not had, nor will we have, unemployment, since we long ago discarded the fetters of capitalism and the domination of private property. Public-spirited labour and socialist emulation in our factories and plants, in our collective and State farms, on the railways and in our offices, stimulate our economic advance.

Houses, light and heat, health services, films and books, milk and bread and meat and butter—and plenty of them—these are the foundations of the Soviet programme for the next fifteen years or more. Of course their production involves incidentally such a huge development of heavy industry that the U.S.S.R. will become even more powerful in war, if attacked—"guaranteed against any accidents," were Stalin's words—but what an impudent travesty, what a brazen deception of the public, to suggest that this means "Guns before butter"!

Stalin summed up the position afresh in his Order to the Red Army on February 23:—

Having concluded the war by victory over the enemy, the Soviet Union has entered a new, peaceful period of its economic development. At present the Soviet people faces the task of consolidating the positions it has gained and advancing further towards a new economic upsurge. . . .

Within the shortest period of time we must heal the wounds inflicted by the enemy on our country and regain the pre-war level of development of our national economy, in order to surpass that level considerably in the very near future, to raise the material well-being of the people and raise still more the military and economic might of the Soviet State.

The few weeks which have elapsed since then have brought practical proof that this programme is not a mere aspiration. Scores and scores of new pits, power stations and factories are being built, railways being electrified, collective and State farms reconditioned. The People's Commissariat for the Tank Industry has been abolished, and all its plant handed over to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a new Transport Engineering Commissariat, which builds railway engines, coaches, etc. The People's Commissariat for the Motor Industry has been transformed into a new Machine-Tools and Instrument Commissariat, while many of its former factories are once again turning out textile machinery. The People's Commissariat for Munitions has been abolished, and a new People's Commissariat forAgricultural Engineering set up in its place. Special People's Commissariats for Building and Road Building Machinery and for the motor industry, have been set up. The coal mining and oil commissariats have been divided on a regional basis, to ensure greater attention to local problems of production. On February 26 big price reductions for foodstuffs were announced—rye bread 50-60 per cent., other bread 40-60 per cent., meat 10-20 per cent. fish 15-30 per cent., sugar 37 per cent., cheese 15-20 per cent., tea 33 per cent., cigarettes 50 per cent. Every morning the Soviet newspapers nowadays print reports of new schools, colleges, clubs, theatres, cinemas, books and journals and other embellishments and necessities of a people hungry to return to a peaceable, sane constructive civilisation.

These are the policies, these are the aspirations which Churchill denounces as "a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation"—his wild and insensate libels eagerly endorsed by the Vatican, citadel of all that stands for besotted ignorance and reaction in the world, the servile bootlicker of Mussolini, Hitler and Franco, in their years of power.

Certainly, in order finally to accomplish this major task, we need a lengthy period of peace and ensured security of our country. The peace loving policy of the Soviet Union is not some transient phenomenon: it follows from the fundamental interests and essential needs of our people, from its desire as soon as possible to raise its material welfare, from the tremendous urge of our people to create its own new, cultured Socialist life and from the deep confidence of our people that the Soviet Union will successfully accomplish all these tasks—provided the aggressors' pack is chained.

The measured words of Molotov on February 6 show the intimate connection between Soviet constructive work at home and its foreign policy—which is, as before the war, a policy of collaboration with all peoples, great and small, who will maintain friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. But after the horrors of the Second World War the Soviet Union is inflexible in its determination that the aggressors' pack should be chained, as the preliminary condition for world peace. At Moscow and Teheran in 1943, at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, the three Great Powers pledged their word to take the measures necessary to chain the aggressors' pack. The Soviet Union is fulfilling its pledge: Great Britain and the U.S.A. have been breaking theirs. That, too, is not some transient phenomenon.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Science and the Welfare of Mankind

by S. LILLEY, M.Sc., Ph.D.

THE effect of war experiences in changing people's social and political outlook has, perhaps, been nowhere more apparent than among scientists. Before the war the scientists of this country almost unanimously adopted what has been called the "ivory tower" attitude—the view that the scientist's job was merely to pursue his research, taking no notice whatsoever of its social effects. A handful there were, mainly organised in the Association of Scientific Workers, who took the contrary view that the scientist had a responsibility for seeing that his work was used to benefit his fellow men, but these formed a tiny minority. The grim experiences of the war awakened many to social consciousness and the minority grew towards a majority. The A.Sc.W. grew from a small professional body to a trade union 15,000 strong. But the movement was still rather one of the left, and it included very few men who were generally regarded as the leaders of British science.

The atomic bomb produced a very marked change. Its potential use for unheralded mass-destruction and its actual use in recent months as a political bluff weapon have forced the majority of scientists to become seriously concerned with the social effects of their work and with their own responsibility for ensuring that the effects are good.

The change of attitude was clearly brought out at a Conference on *Science and the Welfare of Mankind* organised by the Association of Scientific Workers and held in London on February 15-17. For several years the Association has been calling such conferences on various aspects of the relations of science to social welfare. But till this year these could be regarded (and were often regarded by those who wished to belittle them) as rallying points for progressive scientists, rather than as discussions representative of the general body of scientific opinion. By contrast, this last conference was almost, if not quite, representative of the dominant trends of opinion among scientists today. Though organised by the A.Sc.W., it was far from being confined to that body. Six other important scientific organisations co-operated. Many of the leading figures of British science were among the speakers, including the president, secretary and foreign secretary of the Royal Society, the most ancient and respected scientific organisation in the country, Dr. Julian Huxley, who had just been appointed secretary to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Sir Robert Watson Watt, who was the central figure in the development of radar and several more whose names will appear below. Mr. Herbert Morrison represented the Government. Mr. G. W. Thompson brought greetings from the Trades Union Congress and Mr. Arthur Horner spoke on the relations between scientists and manual workers. There was also wide international representation, with delegates from scientific bodies in France, U.S.A., Canada, China, India, Holland, Poland, S. Africa and the Argentine.

I do not propose to give a formal report of the conference. Rather I want to pick out its main themes and illustrate by quotations, which I think are representative of the whole, the attitudes which predominated. The key-note of the discussion might be well summed up in a sentence from Mr. Morrison's speech near the beginning of the Conference:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are in a time when the sciences, and especially the physical sciences, have developed so rapidly and have put within our reach such power for good or evil, that even the scientists themselves have come out of their remoteness and are attempting, somewhat belatedly perhaps, to visualise the social significance of their work.

Two terrible examples of failure to use science properly for the benefit of mankind dominated the conference—the atomic bomb and the coming world famine. I need say nothing to stress the dangers of the atomic bomb. But it is much less generally realised that the present world food shortage is going to kill far more people than even a moderate-sized atomic war could do. As Dr. H. L. Richardson told the conference:—

As you probably know, there seems to be a shortage of food grains throughout the world of at least 8 million tons during the present half year. On a subsistence basis 8 million tons of food would feed about 60 million people for a year. So you can say that at least 60 million people face starvation.

The direct cause of the famine is, of course, the war. But looking deeper, we see it as a glaring example of the failures of the past to make proper use of science and apply its results. Dr. Richardson put that point clearly:—

There's a little fact of life here which I would commend to you. . . . We know the average effect of sulphate of ammonia on crops in India and China. . . . If you put a hundredweight of sulphate of ammonia on the land you get from two to four hundredweights of extra grain. So that a million tons of sulphate of ammonia will feed something like 20 million people.

The conference faced the fact that scientists can do little or nothing as scientists, to avert this immediate famine—though, as Professor Bernal pointed out, they can do a lot in other capacities, by making the public aware of the facts, and in technical and organisational matters. For the future, however, the answer of science is clear. Dr. Richardson described plans for the scientific improvement of agriculture in India and China which would raise yields by some 25 per cent. within ten years and so feed another 250 million people. The job is to see that those plans become official policy.

Professor Oliphant, F.R.S., one of our foremost atomic scientists, had much to say on the possible uses of atomic energy for constructive purposes:—

It looks as though we have in the world enough uranium to run the power plants of the world, at any rate for a hundred years or so. . . . Now I believe we can have atomic energy if we want it; I believe it is only a question of policy. I believe that the policy of this country at the present time won't give us atomic energy for power purposes in twenty years, but I believe that if we had a sensible policy we might have it in five or ten years' time in an experimental form. And once we have a plant working anywhere, even inefficiently and experimentally, I'm sure that the stimulus to further development will be such that we will be able to look forward to its application in a very big way.

And one of the things we must avoid is being guided in our policy with regard to atomic energy by what is happening in other countries, particularly in the United States of America [with its vast supplies of coal, oil and water power, in contrast to our fuel situation] and the whole of our industrial future may depend on us finding a solution to the problem of atomic energy . . . and we must not leave it to a country like the United States, which has not got the right incentives to drive it, and —what's more—which, like ourselves in many ways, is riddled with vested interests which are more concerned with exploiting existing sources than they are with developing new ones.

Though I am confining these extracts to world agriculture and atomic energy, there were, of course, speakers on other contributions that a correctly chosen scientific policy could make to human welfare—to the advance of medicine, to raising British

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrial efficiency and so helping to solve our pressing economic problems, and so on. But on the whole this conference gave much less time than previous A.Sc.W. conferences to discussing details of the future potentialities of science. It was devoted rather to considerations of the broad conditions under which science can be applied for the greatest benefit of the world, and with the political and social obligations that rest on scientists in seeing that it is so applied.

Nearly every speaker faced the fact that science in the last few decades has only too often been misused so as to bring misery instead of good and that now the scientists must take responsibility for seeing that in the future these perversions are not allowed. Dr. T'U Chang-Wang, just arrived from China, said:—

> The challenge to the scientists of the world today is whether we are going to allow science and the products of science to be used again as weapons to massacre millions of people . . . or whether we are determined to mobilise science for the promotion of the welfare of mankind.

It was recognised that the scientists, by their attitude of aloofness in the past, were responsible for allowing selfish interests to misuse their work. Thus Professor Oliphant, speaking of the present dangers of the atomic bomb, pointed out that this product of the work of scientists had now passed beyond their control:—

> The difficulty is that scientists weren't unanimous—they didn't get together and do the job of settling, or at any rate trying hard to settle the problems which would follow from the release of nuclear energy, before they put a match to that bomb in the American desert that precipitated us all into the present crisis. And now they're merely onlookers, because the manufacturer is now the man who makes atomic bombs ; the military men and the politicians are the people who juggle with them and use them; and we poor scientists can just look round, try to give advice. . . .

Of course, in spite of that it was generally accepted that scientists can still do something very important about the bomb—by putting the problem to the people and enlisting their political strength. But the real moral of this and other contributions was that it must not happen again. In future scientists must investigate the social consequences of their work *before*, not after, they give it to the world; and must plan their work so that the consequences are good. To do that they will have to develop a new code of ethics and that, as Professor A. V. Hill, Foreign Secretary to the Royal Society, pointed out, will be no easy job:—

> We can scarcely expect a common standard of scientific ethics to appear ready-made. All kinds of difficulties will be evident, partly from political barriers and lack of freedom, partly from the scientists themselves who are—many of them—pretty peculiar creatures to steer in a common direction, not least from the big bosses who look upon science as a purchasable commodity. . . .

He went on to sketch his own ideas of an ethical code for scientists. It included such obligations as "to question and discuss the nature of their own calling and its special contribution to national and international welfare," to avoid secrecy and secretiveness as necessary conditions of work," "not to exploit the common property of science for base or selfish ends: and to refuse conditions of employment or advancement, however otherwise attractive, which do not meet (these) ethical requirements," and "to refuse to co-operate in tasks in which they, or their representatives, are not allowed a reasonable share or partnership in the responsibility of deciding on the purpose, policy and probable result of their work."

Any discussion of the methods of ensuring the use of science for the general good of the people, inevitably raises the question of planning and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

co-ordination. Hitherto a large proportion of scientists have been fearful of planning, because they thought it implied regimentation and dictatorship (and they have therefore been easy prey to those who opposed planning for reactionary political ends). At this conference, however, the need for planning was accepted as axiomatic. Sir Robert Robinson, president of the Royal Society, put the point this way:—

Some, I know, fondly imagine that they plough a lonely furrow, but a little reflection on the basis of their individualism would quickly disclose the hollows of that pretence. That being so, we must all earnestly desire to make our co-operation more and more effective. . . . Organisation does not mean control and direction in any objectionable sense. It does imply co-ordination and it is consistent with the fostering of independent thought and action.

That statement was made at the very beginning of the conference, and it was not challenged, as it certainly would have been a year ago, though a great deal was said by others on the methods of planning *democratically* and the dangers to be avoided.

While the conference was sitting the great Canadian spy scare flashed into the news and added further point to the many speakers who stressed the dangers of the growing secrecy in scientific matters. Professor Joliot-Curie of France, in a paper that was read for him in his absence, said:—

I consider as very dangerous . . . the position taken up by the United States during the recent talks, because keeping the secrets of the atomic bomb appears as a means of pressure. . . . This principle of secrecy once accepted, there is no reason why it should not be extended to all fields of science. Chemistry, electricity, medicine, biology, even astronomy, lead to discoveries which affect the condition of man and can be applied in a decisive manner to economics or war. If secrecy is extended to these sciences, the progress of civilisation will be slowed down and may even be halted. We count upon the Union of Scientists in every country to militate against the maintenance of the secret and to obtain a wide divulgation of the discoveries.

Professor J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., pointed to the political reasons for this secrecy, when he said that during the war,

We might reasonably have been expected to have done to the Soviet Union what we have done with our other ally, the United States. If we had done this, had made a full exchange of technical and scientific information, the present situation wouldn't have arisen. It isn't any less necessary to do now what we failed to do then.

The protest against the shackles of secrecy was unanimous. Further points about it were made by Dr. Grant Lathe of Canada and Dr. John A. Simpson, an atomic bomb scientist from U.S.A. Dr. Simpson told of the tremendous publicity drive on this subject undertaken by the Federation of American Scientists who had already reached between 10 and 40 million people in their efforts to explain the problems created by the atomic bomb.

The atomic bomb naturally got a large share of the discussion, more than I can possibly indicate here. Professor P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S., gave a full analysis of the problem. He approved of the United Nations resolution on the subject as pointing the path forward. But he also issued a strong warning:—

But to draw up wise and bold resolutions is not enough. Action has to follow. And this is where we all come in. Now we must make no mistake. There will be scoffers and doubters, who will try to whittle down the great objectives of the commission; who will deride the possibility of effective control; . . . who will support in words the most utopian schemes in the hope that nothing will be done. I am convinced that the utmost public initiative is required in all countries of the world, and the utmost vigilance to ensure that these terms of reference are readily acted on.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Several other speakers emphasised this point, that the job of ensuring the proper use of science could not be left to the scientists. The whole people must assert their wish to have science used for their benefit. Mr. Arthur Horner said that the working-class movement would support the efforts of scientists, provided that scientists help them to understand the problems:—

I think you are obligated to inform us of the nature of vested or selfish or reactionary interests who seek to restrict and hold back the application of your discoveries. . . . And we (i.e., the labour movement) will assist you in war against such interests, for they are robbing us, the majority of the people, of the results of your research and your experimentation.

But Mr. Horner spoke also of one of the great difficulties in the way of this co-operation. Science has been used so often in the past in a way which damaged the interests of the worker—by creating (apparently) unemployment, driving out skilled workers, etc.—that many workers distrust it. Therefore, he said, it is the job of scientists

to win the confidence of the average worker who still fears deep down in his heart that he will suffer because of the progress which you will enable us to make. You can only do this by demonstrating that you have a social conscience equal to ours. To that end you must be willing to organise. You must become a collective force in alliance with the organised workers, engaged in a common progressive movement aiming at the establishment of prosperity in our country and peace throughout the world.

—and in that connection he referred favourably to the work of the A.Sc.W. in the T.U.C. The applause that frequently interrupted him showed how widely these sentiments were shared by the scientists present.

It would be an exaggeration to suggest that this conference means that the mass of scientists are likely soon to become whole-hearted fighters for the cause of the people against reaction, but it would be equally wrong for the labour movement to ignore the very marked change that has taken place. As well as those 15,000 scientists who, through the A.Sc.W., are an integral part of the trade union movement, a further large and representative section have been sufficiently awakened to their social responsibilities to constitute an important progressive force, of which the labour movement must be aware. The demands of scientists—use of science for social good, abandonment of restrictive secrecy, and so on—are also in the interests of the people as a whole, and that fact can become the basis of a growing co-operation.

German Workers Unite

by J. WINTERNITZ

THERE is no country where the labour and progressive movement had to pay such a terrible price for disunity as in Germany. The German working-class, which was the first to create a mass party based on the theory of Marxism, a working-class whose first conscious steps were guided by Marx and Engels, a movement which was regarded as an example of firm principles and solid mass organisation in the Socialist International for decades, was corrupted and split by the influence of reformist ideas, by the infiltration of imperialist ideologies. By years of internal struggles between Social Democrats and Communists the whole movement was so weakened, that in 1933 the Hitler Government could destroy the workers' parties, trade unions, co-operatives — which still

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commanded 12 millions of followers—without encountering effective mass resistance. For twelve years the German working-class, which once could claim to be the best organised in the world, was reduced to utter impotence, became a hopeless victim or—even worse—a tool of the most reactionary inhuman imperialist regime the world has ever seen.

One would despair in the reason of man if the German workers had not learned the lesson. When Germany emerged from the war, the urge to unity of all anti-fascist forces was overwhelming. Unity of action between the four anti-fascist parties was established throughout the Reich. Backbone of this unity was the close co-operation of the Communist and the Social Democratic parties.

From the first day of liberation the question of complete unity, of the fusion of the two parties, was widely discussed. It was generally understood that practical co-operation in overcoming the terrible difficulties of a defeated, devastated, occupied country with its very strong remnants of fascist ideology and reactionary forces, would, (together with comradely discussions of ideological and political differences) lead to the formation of a united working-class party. It is an indication of the feeling of the masses that even now, when some of the Social Democratic leaders are organising the most vicious campaign against unity, they only dare to propose postponement. No one dares openly deny the necessity of unity.

Developments towards unity are most advanced in the Soviet occupied zone. This is easily understandable without giving any credit to fantastic and mischievous stories about Russian secret police pressure. The simple fact is that democratic parties and organisations could develop their work earlier and much more freely in the Soviet zone as compared with the other zones. Socialists and Communists had practical experience in building up a new democratic administration, in getting industry going, in carrying through the land reform, in purging public life from Nazis and reactionaries. The great success of this political co-operation was the strongest argument for speedy amalgamation.

It should be clearly understood that the leaders of the Berlin Central Executive are able to claim that they are the only survivors of the Central Executive of the S.P.D. which took over when the Party leadership (Parteivorstand) left Germany in 1933. Thus they claim to be the only legal representatives of the Central Executive till a new Congress elects a new executive.

When on December 20 and 21, 1945, a conference was called to Berlin of the Central Committees and leading district functionaries of the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party for the Eastern zone, to discuss the next steps to complete unity, the parties could survey solid achievements of their common work.

A completely new democratic self-administration had been built up, fundamentally cleansed of Nazi elements, the Land Reform had eradicated one of the most important roots of reaction, the fundamentals of a democratic school reform were created. Successes were achieved in getting at least a minimum of nutrition for the people, in fighting want, unemployment, inflation, etc. The workers and employees have won far-reaching democratic rights in the management of production.

But the work of building up a new democratic Germany, of firstly destroying the sinister forces of German fascism and imperialism is far from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

completed.* The resolution, unanimously adopted by the common conference, stresses the point that Hitler-fascism was nothing but the tool of monopoly capitalism. As long as the power of trusts and cartels is not definitely broken, the danger of reactionary restoration is not eliminated. But monopoly capitalism has still a basis in German economy, it has many allies, it has deep roots in the minds of large sections of the German people, still influenced by the traditions of militarism, race theories and chauvinistic ideas :

The only force, which can finally overcome the dark forces of reaction, militarism and fascism, is the united working-class, in close alliance with the peasants and the working intelligentsia.

In the present position, where Hitler-fascism has, by its war crimes and million-fold crimes against other peoples, endangered the national unity of Germany, it is only the unity of all anti-fascist and democratic forces of the people, throughout the whole of Germany, which embodies and represents national German unity.

The leaders of the two parties decided that the historical moment for the formation of the United Party had arrived. The basic ideas for the programme and organisation of the United Party were unanimously accepted :

In principle the minimum programme of this party will demand the completion of the democratic rebuilding of Germany as an anti-fascist democratic parliamentary republic with legally protected far-going political, economic and social rights of the workers and all working masses. The maximum programme is the realisation of Socialism by the political power of the working-class, according to the teachings of consistent Marxism as laid down in the "Communist Manifesto," in the Eisenach Programme of German Social Democracy and in the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" by Marx and Engels.

The United Party is to be self-reliant and independent. Its politics and tactics are to be developed according to the interests of the German working masses and the special conditions existing in Germany. In realising its minimum as well as its maximum programme, it will have to find its own way, based on the particularities of the development of the German people. The complete destruction of the old state apparatus and the consistent continuation of the democratic regeneration of Germany may create new and special forms of transition to the political power of the working-class and to Socialism.

In the part it plays in the day-to-day struggle and in its social composition, the United Party is to be the class party of the workers and the party of the whole working people. Its internal constitution will be thoroughly democratic. It will defend all truly national interests of the German people, which is possible only by leading the German people back into the community of the peace-loving nations.

In accordance with the best traditions of the working-class movement, the United Party will be faithfully devoted to the idea of proletarian internationalism, and in this spirit it will work towards the creation of firm relations to the working-class movement of the bourgeois countries as well as to the working-class movement of the Soviet Union. It will seek the support of the working-class movement of other countries for its struggle, just as it is its duty actively to advance the cause of peace, democracy, progress and socialism in every other country and energetically to fight every expression of chauvinism, race or national hatred, and anti-Soviet propaganda.

These are the main items of the resolution which marks a turning-point of historical importance for the working-class movement. The Berlin unity decision has been welcomed with enthusiasm throughout Germany. Factory meetings, public meetings, common conferences of the two parties pronounced their agreement and the practical forms of co-operation, proposed in the resolution, have been established in many places.

*In the Western and Southern zones it has hardly begun.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A powerful force for unity are the resurgent trade unions. These were organised on the basis of unity in all zones from the beginning. This is a great step forward. For there is an old tradition of separate Christian and Liberal trade unions while some of the free unions had been split in the Weimar Republic by the expulsion of Communists. This unfortunate tradition of a politically disunited trade union movement is definitely overcome. Representative conferences of trade union delegates from Berlin and from the whole Soviet occupied zone, held in the beginning of February, were impressive demonstrations of the desire of the working-class for unity.

Meanwhile the enemies of unity in the Social Democratic party who hold leading positions in the Western zones opened a counter-offensive. Dr. K. Schumacher, leader of the Social Democratic organisations in the Western zones, organised conferences of party officials at Hanover and Frankfurt, where anti-unity resolutions were passed. Schumacher refuses to recognise the authority of the Berlin Central Executive of his party, headed by Otto Grotewohl. He asserts that only a party congress for the whole of Germany would be entitled to decide the unity question. But he does everything in his power to prevent such a congress. In February Schumacher came to Berlin with the purpose of persuading the Central Committee to postpone unification to an indefinite future. He contends that only when all zonal divisions will disappear and when allied occupation will end, a decision on fusion could be taken. As allied occupation is meant to go on for many years, this argument only proves that Schumacher's acceptance of unity "in principle" follows Bismarck's diplomatic advice: "To accept something in principle, means to refuse it in practice." Schumacher could not shake the resolve of the Berlin Social Democratic leaders. His only success was to stir up the opposition of some party officials in Berlin. It is not astonishing that among the Socialist "old guard," who are living in memories of the past which was filled with bitter fighting against growing Communist influence, there is a strong opposition against unity. Such grave diggers of German democracy as K. Severing, the former Prussian Home Secretary, who appeared as "a strong man" in suppressing Communist activities, but surrendered meekly to an officer and three men, sent by Papen, in 1932; or ill-famed Zoergiebel, who ordered the police to shoot upon the May Day demonstration in Berlin in 1929, are still active in the Social Democratic party in the British zone.

Nor should it be denied that the public utterances of such Labour leaders as Bevin very much encourage those opportunists among the Socialist leaders who hope to curry favour with the British authorities by taking a strong anti-Communist and anti-Soviet line.

It is difficult to judge the relation of forces between the supporters and the enemies of unity in the British and in the American zones. There has been no free discussion in party papers (the first party papers for the British zone were allowed on March 1), nor much opportunity for free public discussions among the workers.

On February 26, at another joint conference of the Social Democratic and Communist Central Committees, it was decided to call Party conferences on April 21 and 22 to take the final decisions on fusion. Representatives from the Western zones are invited to the Social Democratic conference. But Schumacher decided to boycott this conference and, through a meeting held at Offenbach in the beginning of March, even threatened delegates who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would go to the Berlin Conference with expulsion from the Party.

Under these circumstances the two parties decided to carry through the fusion in every district or province where conditions are ripe. District conferences will be held in the beginning of April throughout the Soviet-occupied zone. In Thuringia, Saxony, Mecklenburg resolutions for speediest fusion have already been accepted.

The conference of the Communist Party held in Berlin on March 2 and 3 proved the vigour and the unity of the party. The policy of unity was unanimously endorsed. The conference could speak for a membership of 671,000. The Communist Party is the only party in Germany which has a firm organisation with a clear policy in all parts of Germany. Even if the fusion be carried through at first only in the Eastern zone, the United Socialist Party with more than one million members, will become the strongest political force in the country.

It should be stressed that this unity, far from threatening the democratic parties of the middle class, will strengthen the unity of all democratic forces. The whole power of the United Socialist Party will be turned against the still powerful forces of fascist and imperialist reaction.

One may ask whose purposes are served by the violent campaign against working-class unity in English papers and by the obstruction of the unity movement by British occupation authorities.

The victory of working-class unity in Germany will be a victory for world democracy and world peace. It should be welcomed by progressive people everywhere.

The French Political Scene

by DEREK KARTUN

THE fight of reaction against the forward march of democracy in France, which from the time of the liberation had been based upon the existence in power of a nominated government carefully weighted on the side of reaction, entered a new phase at the end of last October when the first postwar elections took place. Under the leadership of General de Gaulle and with the mistaken support of the Socialists, the electoral law of October 21 was fastened on the country for the duration of the Consultative Assembly. This law successfully curbed the Assembly's powers and sheltered the government from effective criticism by the Socialist-Communist majority.

De Gaulle's referendum also gave him a moral ascendancy which very rapidly made the cabinet into much the same type of one-man-band that the previous Algiers government had been. Important matters were kept off cabinet agendas and every conceivable device was used by reaction to prevent the programme to which the three main parties were committed from being put into operation. Urgent structural reforms such as the bank nationalisation bill were drastically curtailed: reductions in army estimates were refused by the General under threat of resignation: vital salary increases for civil servants were turned down under threat of resignation by the M.R.P. (Catholic) ministers. It was a period of hard braking on the part of French reaction who were represented in the cabinet by de Gaulle and the M.R.P. and constant straining on the part of the Socialist and Communist parties to get those measures

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carried out which were absolutely vital for the consolidation of democracy and the rebuilding of France's shattered economy.

By the end of January, confronted with a drawing together of the left-wing parties in defence of their programme and discerning the dark shadow of impending economic disaster, the ruling class decided to withdraw the General from the front line and keep him in reserve to fight another day. Upon a specious and unconvincing pretext General deGaulle suddenly resigned on January 20 and declared through his friends that he had definitely retired from political life.

Owing to the reluctance of the Socialists to work in a two-party government with the Communists and the refusal of the M.R.P. to participate in any government led by the Communist Party, it was hoped and expected that complete political deadlock would ensue. Such a deadlock, at a time of widespread public indignation at the worsening food situation, might lead to a call for the General to return to power on his own terms, immensely strengthened after a second direct mandate from the people over the head of the Assembly. But a supple and conciliatory attitude on the part of the Communists, who waived their legitimate right as the largest party to claim the leadership of the government and a sudden awakening of the Socialists to the fact that they had been gravely misled by the General in whom they had placed so much faith in the October elections, successfully countered this manoeuvre. A government was formed in the remarkably short time of six days under the presidency of Socialist Felix Gouin, whose good record in the working-class movement and previous position as president of the Assembly placed him above the parties and thus made him a suitable figure to hold the three participants in the new government together. In spite of severe internal disagreements and upheavals which were to reassert themselves more sharply at a later date the M.R.P. agreed to join the Gouin ministry.

A government having been successfully formed, it was still hoped by French reaction that it would be wrecked on the fearful legacy which the de Gaulle administration had left behind. Writing early in February Jacques Duclos said:—

> During the ministerial crisis of last January the plan of reaction was simple: it was a question of showing that the Constituent Assembly was incapable of forming a government and if the hopes of reaction had been fulfilled we would then have witnessed an offensive from that quarter which would seriously have menaced democracy in our country. And now the plan of reaction is still the same: it is a question of preventing the government from carrying out its task of restoring the health of the country's finances. If that were successful then a mortal blow could be dealt to democracy and a situation could be produced favourable to the plans of the enemies of the people. Actually, we must expect that everything will be done to hinder the government in the execution of its task.

It was found, to the immense surprise of the political leaders and the whole country, that de Gaulle's protégé at the Ministry of Finance, René Pleven, had left the financial affairs of the country in a ruinous position and, with the connivance of the General, had managed to keep the truth entirely hidden from the previous cabinet. France had been printing a billion francs of paper money every day for several months and was embarked upon a wild inflationary spiral. The country was living well above its means and a few more weeks would inevitably have led to disaster. The food situation, too, was deteriorating and dissatisfaction was widespread.

Reaction estimated that in such circumstances no government which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lacked the commanding presence and national prestige of de Gaulle could possibly survive for more than a week or two. But the people of France in the last few weeks have responded to the frank statements of the Gouin cabinet, which took the country into its confidence and gave a complete account of the grave financial difficulties. Signs are just appearing that public confidence in the government is being consolidated. At the beginning of March, for the first time since the liberation, subscriptions to treasury bonds exceeded redemptions by 18 billion francs. Inflation has been arrested and national savings show a steady increase over the January and February totals. These facts are the reflection of the confidence of the small bourgeoisie, the mass of the saving public in France, in the government. In the first three days after being placed on the market three-fifths of the loan destined for the nationalisation of the mines were subscribed.

Above all, the French workers have demonstrated once again their high level of political understanding by responding magnificently to Maurice Thorez' repeated entreaties for greater production. The Communist Party is waging a nationwide campaign for more coal, steel, textiles and building materials, and the workers have understood that the whole future of democracy in France depends upon their ability to get the wheels of industry turning again. French reaction has understood precisely the same thing, and every effort of the Communists and the trade unions to increase production is being met with countermoves from the other side.

The Minister of Labour, Ambroise Croizat, recently decreed increases on overtime rates above forty hours to encourage production. The immediate reaction of many employers has been to reduce working hours. Many factories which used to work 48 hours weekly are now on 45 or even 40 hours. Communist Production Minister Marcel Paul's nationalisation project for the gas and electricity industries, which was accepted some time back by all three government parties, was being opposed during March by the M.R.P. The effect of such delaying tactics is to retard once again the economic recovery of the country.

In spite of this sabotage impressive efforts are being made by the workers in the face of extreme practical difficulties and hardships. The battle for coal has been won with production now in excess of prewar output: several new blast furnaces have been lighted in recent weeks with a resultant increase in steel production: some textile factories have so far solved their raw material and fuel problems as to be working three eight-hour shifts daily.

While this battle has been proceeding on the home front reaction has been making desperate attempts to rally its friends in Britain and America against the forward march of the French people. When General de Gaulle resigned in January his Minister of Information, André Malraux, was busy painting grim pictures to British and American journalists of of the dangers of a "Russian-dominated government" in France. Maurice Schumann, Secretary of the M.R.P., repeated in a recent speech the old cry of General de Gaulle that the French Communists are dominated by Moscow. He added, to make full measure, that the Socialists are dominated by London and that therefore only the M.R.P. was capable of providing France with a foreign policy which would maintain the balance between east and west.

With the commencement on March 1 of the constitutional discussions in the Assembly, the game of French reaction has entered upon a new and extremely important phase.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Side by side with the efforts to retard economic recovery, the struggle against a democratic constitution, in fact against any constitution at all, is now being waged by the M.R.P. with the active support of the extreme right. The general strategy is a sort of French filibuster to prevent the passing of the constitutional project before the expiry of the life of the Constituent Assembly at the end of April. It may be expected that every important clause will be haggled and quarrelled over in the hope that nothing will be decided and that France will have to embark upon a further "provisional" period in order to elaborate her new constitution. Such an eventuality would be catastrophic. Public disgust and cynicism and governmental instability would then provide the perfect atmosphere for appeals to be made to the "reluctant" General to return as the strong-man saviour of the country.

To provide against the possible failure of this broad strategy, however, the M.R.P. are fighting tooth and nail at the same time for modifications in the constitutional project (in most essentials a good piece of Socialist-Communist co-operative work) which would leave open a back door through which de Gaulle might in the last resort squeeze himself. The very fight for this modification is also an important part of the general delaying tactic. The M.R.P., at the time of writing, have rebelled at the method proposed for electing the president of the Republic. The Communists and Socialists insist that in order to avoid the slightest suspicion of placing him above and apart from the elected representatives of the people the president should be elected by the Sovereign Assembly alone. The M.R.P. propose that he should be elected by the Sovereign Assembly together with the Consultative Chamber (which is itself elected by indirect suffrage). This would clearly mean that the president of the Republic would have powers over the representatives of the people which he derives from another and largely uncontrollable source. It is the only way left to the M.R.P. to get de Gaulle elected and it is the only type of presidential set-up which would give him the powers they desire him to have.

The French people already know from experience that the Communists produce highly competent ministers and the work of the eight Communist members of the Gouin cabinet is winning daily support for the Communist Party throughout the country. Greatest progress is being recorded in the rural areas, once the almost exclusive preserve of the Radicals.

Meanwhile the M.R.P. have shown marked signs of restlessness and will probably seize the first pretext for leaving the government in order the better to prepare their electoral campaign.

The dangerous manoeuvres of French reaction are also spurred on by the improved relations in recent weeks between Communists and Socialists. The call for unity is becoming louder in the ranks of the Socialist Party, where many rank and filers have understood that the reason for the steady draining away of support from their Party may be found to be due to the recent policy of flirtation with the reactionary M.R.P. This desire for agreement between the two working-class parties is finding its reflection in the work at higher levels. There has been good co-operation, after a very bad start, on the framing of the constitution, and the attacks and polemics between the Socialist and Communist press have now ceased. At the recent mighty demonstration in Paris to commemorate the defeat of fascism on February 6, 1934, the procession of 50,000 workers was significantly headed by the Socialist-Communist co-ordination committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Particularly important has been the rejection by the February Conference of Socialist District Secretaries of Léon Blum's proposals for redrafting the Party's Charter. The Conference voted for the retention of the phrase "collective communist society" in the statement of aims. Indignation ran high at the Conference and Léon Blum's mystical and fundamentally anti-Communist and anti-unitarian proposals have been shelved, probably for good.

De Gaulle and his friends, with sound political insight, have correctly estimated this rapprochement of the two working-class parties as the greatest single danger to their plans, and the right-wing press has been exhorting the Socialists to keep away from the Communists and play their historic role as the last defenders of the "christian way of life." But because the situation in France demands a close alliance of the democratic parties, such an alliance is being painfully but inevitably worked out, in spite of the propaganda of the Right and the bitter opposition of Léon Blum, Vincent Auriol and other old-guard leaders.

One aspect of this important consolidation on the left has been the final break between the Socialists and the dangerous de Gaullist splinter group known as the U.D.S.R. In spite of repeated warnings from the Communist Party, the Socialists made Common lists with U.D.S.R. candidates in many constituencies at the last elections. Now this group of political adventurers and representatives of de Gaulle's secret police are manoeuvring for a centre alliance with the Radicals which would squeeze a new centre party in between the Socialists and the M.R.P. and might take votes from both. This may well lead to the further disintegration of the latter party, already torn by internecine strife and already losing right-wing support to the newly formed P.R.L. (Republican Liberty Party).

This new right-wing formation groups several of the old reactionary parties and has already embarked upon an election campaign of vilification of the government and wild stories of impending financial collapse designed to produce fresh difficulties for the Gouin administration. There are indications that the right-wing vote will be withdrawn from the M.R.P. which has served its purpose and will revert to the traditional right-wing parties, chief of which is now the P.R.L.

Jacques Duclos, in a recent article in *Les Cahiers du Communisme*, has said that the "great battle that is being fought out at the present time is a battle between reaction and democracy." French reaction has seen the growing strength of the Communist Party and the growing desire for unity among the Socialist workers. It has seen its efforts to destroy the Gouin government by provoking financial collapse fail utterly. It has seen its schemes to produce an undemocratic constitution and to engineer the return of de Gaulle being combated by a Socialist-Communist coalition in defence of the Republic. It knows full well that it is threatened today as it has never before been threatened, and in such a situation the plan of the French ruling class ceases to be the traditional struggle to maintain parliamentary power and becomes a struggle against the democracy which is dispossessing it and threatening its privileged position.

The political scene in France affords clear practical proof of the correctness of the marxist conception of the present phase of the march towards Socialism as a struggle for ever extended and fuller democracy. Such a fight in France is synonymous with the resounding and inescapable defeat of the remnants of Vichy and of fascism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the final destruction of the power of the trusts.

The winning of the fight by the French people will mean economic recovery, a more democratic constitution and the safeguarding of national independence.

While the General remains quietly in the background, these manoeuvres have continued and will continue with the constant aim of producing a situation suitable for his return under conditions permitting him to assume dictatorial powers. It is interesting to note in support of this estimate that the present fight of the M.R.P. is along exactly the same lines that de Gaulle himself was following when he was taking a semi-open part in the discussions on the new constitution. And it should be remembered that the higher levels of the army and the secret political police are the most bitter enemies of democracy and the staunchest supporters of the General.

These successive moves of reaction in France, each more wild and desperate than the last, and each more fundamentally opposed to the vital needs of the country, are dictated by the inexorable march of events in the country and the steadily rising tide of support for the Communist Party.

A recent Gallup poll has revealed that the Communists may expect a 6 per cent. increase in their suffrage, against a 4 per cent. drop for the Socialists, a 3 per cent. drop for the M.R.P. and a 1 per cent. drop for the Right. The Radical-Socialists are rated for a 2 per cent. increase. All indications are that the Communists will gain even more heavily than this and will emerge very clearly as the largest party in the country with an incontrovertible right to lead the government. The party intends to ask the country to return sufficient Communist members at the elections to give them for the first time in their history the direction of the government. Maurice Thorez, who has been Minister of State and is now Vice-Premier, would be the first Communist Prime Minister of France, and the Communist Party would take its full quota of the main political posts in the cabinet.

For a Democratic B.B.C.

by PEGGIE MacIVER

HARDLY anyone in the labour movement—except apparently the Government—would deny that there is something fundamentally wrong with the B.B.C., but there is widespread confusion as to its diagnosis and cure. Confusion which expresses itself in the paradoxical division of opinion whereby it tends to be Conservatives—the champions of private enterprise—who approve of this particular piece of nationalisation and some Labour supporters whose thoughts are turning towards commercial broadcasting.

The source of the B.B.C.'s deficiencies (and also of this confusion) lies, I believe, in the fact that a potentially progressive broadcasting organisation has been forced into a constitutional strait-jacket, designed to prevent the people, and particularly the organised labour movement, from reaching the microphone or influencing the content of programmes. The B.B.C. was "nationalised" by the Baldwin Government in 1926—immediately after it had been discovered during the General Strike that broadcasting was a political weapon of remarkable power—and given a Charter designed primarily to prevent it becoming a progressive force in politics.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But on the other hand, the B.B.C. has, and always has had, certain very real progressive characteristics, particularly in the cultural field, arising out of the fact that it is a pioneer public service, emancipated from the need to think in terms of profits.

These two elements in its character —a reactionary constitution and the progressive impetus given by the absence of commercialisation—have always been at war inside the B.B.C. Their co-existence has served to confuse everyone but the Conservatives as to the true nature of the organisation, and thus offer an excellent breeding-ground for the myth they have so assiduously propagated to the effect that the " independence " of the B.B.C. is —in some intangible and undefinable way—a desirable and democratic thing.

Now that the political life of the country has taken such a decisive progressive turn, this conflict between the potentialities of our broadcasting organisation and its constitution has intensified. The former are in process of being strangled.

It is with this in mind that the following proposals for a new constitution, to replace the Charter when it expires at the end of the year, are put forward. I also feel that it is by considering a concrete alternative that one sees most clearly how ill-suited the present Charter is, both to the traditions of British democracy and to the needs of broadcasting.

1. *Parliamentary Control*

That the present Royal Charter be replaced by an Act of Parliament which places responsibility for the policy and operation of the B.B.C. in the hands of a Minister answerable to Parliament.

2. *Governing Boards*

That the present single Board of Governors, appointed by the Crown, be replaced by one National and a series of separate Regional Boards, each appointed by the Minister with the approval of Parliament.

That the personnel of each Board be selected with a view to being genuinely representative of the public, and should in each case include representatives of working-class organisations.

That each Board should have a full-time Chairman.

3. *Regions*

That the Regions (which it is anticipated may increase in number from the present seven as technical factors make this possible) should operate entirely independently of the central broadcasting organisation.

Each Region to be entitled to a certain proportion of the total B.B.C. revenue to use as it wishes, and each Regional Governing Board to have direct access to the Minister.

4. *Advisory Committees*

It should be made a statutory obligation on the B.B.C. to set up Advisory Committees, both national and regional in scope, to cover all sides of broadcasting (talks, drama, education, music, programmes for children, etc.).

These Committees should be composed of representatives of political parties, trade unions, professional organisations, cultural organisations and democratic societies of all kinds—as appropriate in each case. The representatives on these Committees should be chosen by the organisations concerned and *not* nominated by the Minister or the B.B.C.

The recommendations of the Committees, and the action taken on them by the B.B.C., should be made public.

The Committees should be entitled to every facility (such as access to Listener Research results, the right to talk to individual B.B.C. employees) to enable them to work effectively.

5. *Freedom of Speech*

That it should be established as a matter of right :

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) That the main political parties should each be allotted a broadcasting period (at a peak listening time) once a month to express freely their views on current affairs.

(2) That political and cultural organisations, willing to pay the necessary expenses, should be entitled to have facilities for putting on programmes and making their views known to the public.

6. *B.B.C. Employees*

To further the efficiency of the organisation and the welfare of the staff, joint-production committees, on which representatives of the management and the unions sit, should be set up in every B.B.C. establishment.

Members of the staff and non-members on long-term contracts should be entitled to be represented on these committees.

These proposals set out, firstly, to establish the kind of democratic controls over the B.B.C. which will ensure that its policy and programmes—in so far as they touch politics—are brought into line with the wishes of the people, and to give the latter, through their democratic organisations, a right to participate in its management. They aim, secondly, to direct the organisation onto a path of decentralisation and co-operation with the listening public, likely to produce an enormous improvement in the quality of all the programmes.

Parliamentary control will automatically bring about a complete transformation in the political status of the B.B.C. Policy decisions, at present made behind closed doors by people whose outlook and political affiliations are unknown (even if they can be guessed at) will become public property, liable to be challenged at any time on the floor of the House.

Arising out of this, the whole country will gain the right to know anything and everything about the affairs of the B.B.C. The importance of this right to knowledge can hardly be exaggerated, both as a democratic safeguard and as a stimulus to better broadcasting. Informed public discussion (at present quite impossible) will of itself cure a great many of the minor ills of the B.B.C.

The choice of an entirely different kind of person for the Boards of Governors is also a key issue. Throughout its history, the choice of Governors has served, more perhaps than anything else, to "give away" the class character of the B.B.C. The labour movement has never been represented. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman are now, as they were before the war, big-business men,* while the rest of the Board has always been a compound of retired journalists or politicians and well-known public figures with far too many other interests and activities to give more than a fraction of their time to the work.

Such a set-up is the antithesis of democracy. Governing Boards which will actively and openly direct the operations of the B.B.C. on behalf of the public are needed, and which will include, as a matter of right, the representation of the working-class movement to which its status in the country should entitle it.

The proposal that political and cultural organisations should be given access to the microphone provides an additional safeguard of freedom of speech. It is definitely suggested that these organisations should bring whoever they chose to the microphone, to speak absolutely without interference from the B.B.C. There is no freedom

* The present chairman—Sir Allan Powell— is chairman and managing director of Briggs Motor Bodies, an American-owned concern connected with Fords.

The vice-chairman is Capt. C. H. G. Millis, director of Baring Brothers.

The chairman for many years before the war was R. C. Norman, brother of Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of speech over the air in Britain now, and there never has been. The B.B.C. decides who shall come to the microphone and exercises very great influence over what they say.* Not the least of the causes of current feeling in favour of commercial broadcasting, is the belief that it would make possible something a great deal nearer freedom of speech than this.

Regional autonomy and the establishment of representative Advisory Committees would also strengthen democratic influence over the B.B.C., but derive their major importance from the fact that they are the gateway to good broadcasting in the fields of culture and entertainment. Neither proposal is in the least new; both have been recommended time and again by official committees, M.P.s and organisations of every point of view. The B.B.C.'s refusal to accept them is further evidence of the way the development of broadcasting as a public service has been sacrificed to its organisation as an instrument of politics.

Without organised co-operation between those at the microphone and those at the loudspeaker, a broadcasting organisation is like a body without blood in its veins. In fact, I believe that it is this bloodlessness, this lack of drive, resulting from the barrier which the Charter places between the programme workers and the public, which is the cause of the general (not consciously political) unpopularity of the B.B.C.

Regional autonomy will bring competition into broadcasting as well as new cultural influences and new talent from all over the country. Advisory Committees will open the door for broadcasters to work with and learn from their public, and for new ideas and new objectives to be injected into broadcasting by the people.

I, personally, believe that lively and active Advisory Committees will be the making of British broadcasting in every field. There are far more ideas for radio programmes in the heads of the listeners than have ever been generated inside Broadcasting House. As people grasp the potentialities of this marvellous medium of expression, they will develop an urge to use it as an instrument of progress and enlightenment. They will also realise that because it is *theirs*, they can use it as a powerful counter-force against the Beaverbrooks and the Arthur Ranks, whose ownership of other media of expression is such a menace to the future of democracy.

* This has been testified by dozens of people who have had personal experience of it—most recently by Francis Williams in *Press, Parliament and People*.

Book Reviews

Coupland's Plan for India

India: A Re-statement by Sir Reginald Coupland (Oxford University Press, 12*s*6*d* net.)

ALTHOUGH THE emphasis on "Regionalism" has been toned down in this "Re-statement," it remains in all respects the original semi-official "Coupland Plan" for giving India the shadow of independence without its substance.

Briefly, it is proposed that the present territorial divisions within India, arbitrary and irrational as they are, should form the boundaries of so many "quasi sovereign states"; and that the Central Government (limited to a "minimal" field comprising defence and foreign affairs, sea customs and currency) should function only as their instrument or "agent."

Four subsidiary points may also be noted: (1) The Executive to be irremovable and irresponsible, and may be autocratic (in the Princes' territories); (2) Legislatures, where they exist, to be based on separate communal electorates;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) The Central Government's competence to be further restricted by "external factors"—"undertakings will be given about which Hindus and Moslems will not be free to quarrel"; (4) A treaty with Britain on the model of that which Egypt is now struggling to shake off.

Where, in this constitutional scheme, does power lie? The units will be "quasi-sovereign states," the Centre merely an "agency." Would power lie ultimately with the people of India as a whole? No, says Prof. Coupland, that would be the "uninational fallacy." Would it lie then with the Hindus and Moslems as separate religious communities?

It is precisely this fundamental issue of the location of power, or sovereignty, in the "free" India, that is never faced squarely or adequately by this imperialist constitutional expert—that is, indeed, evaded and left obscure throughout a lengthy exposition. No wonder that the Plan has been likened to the prospectus of a company lawyer trying to trick the main contributor out of his shareholding.

Prof. Coupland argues that his scheme offers the only basis for reconciling Mr. Jinnah's Pakistan claim with the case for preserving Indian unity. What is certain is that it inflicts on India not a single, but a multiple partition, and at the same time fails to place power in the hands of the people, whether of India considered as a unit, or of the divided segments.

The longest single section in this book—dealing with the history of Indo-British relations as though it were the steady unfolding of a preconceived and beneficent design—is entitled "The Process of Liberation." But Prof. Coupland and others of his school of thought are not really concerned with liberating India. They are bent on producing a "new constitution" and clamping it on the country while British power is still predominant. This aim is diametrically opposed to that of the National Movement which seeks to enforce a transfer of power now, and proceed afterwards to the framing of a constitution which would be truly new because it would be framed by the people themselves, in their newly-won freedom.

K. S. SHELVANKAR.

Another Welcome Revival

The Communist Review, March, 1946, 6*d*.

ONE BY one, old friends return after a wartime or longer hibernation. Recently we welcomed the reappearance of the *Modern Quarterly*. Now we can welcome the reappearance of the *Communist Review* after an interruption of fifteen years. *The Communist Review* is presented as "a theoretical journal of Marxist teaching." There is very much room and need for this. The first number contains important articles by Harry Pollitt on "The Communist Party and the Nation"; by J. R. Campbell on "State Capitalism and the Fight for Socialism"; by George Matthews on "Capitalist Agriculture"; and by Peter Kerrigan on "The Vanguard Party"; as well as a review of Trevelyan's *English Social History* by Christopher Hill, and Answers to Questions by R. Page Arnot. The high standard of this first number offers every ground for confidence that *The Communist Review* will be able to make a valuable contribution to education in Marxism in the labour movement.

R. P. D.

Publications Received

BOOKS

Up From Slavery by Booker T. Washington (O.U.P., 3*s*, 244 pp.).
British Soldier in Greece by Colin Wright (Lawrence & Wishart, 5*s*, 74 pp.).
Government in Public Health by Harry S. Mustard, M.D., LL.D. (O.U.P., 8*s*6*d*, 220 pp.).
Toward a Democratic New Order by David Bryn-Jones (O.U.P., 21*s*6*d*, 288 pp.).

PAMPHLETS

Food for All by G. Adhikari (People's Publishing House (Bombay) 4*ans*., 32 pp.).
A Free and Happy India by P. C. Joshi (People's Publishing House (Bombay) 3*ans*., 24 pp.).
Rural Bengal in Ruins by Bhowani Sen (People's Publishing House (Bombay) 8*ans*., 40 pp.).
The Soviet Union and its Western Neighbours by John Gibbons (Russia Today, 6*d*, 16 pp.).
Soviet Workers and their Unions by Ernest Thornton (Russia Today, 6*d*, 20 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in March, 1946 : £53 : 2 : 5

A RISKY SITUATION

One of our most generous supporters writes . . . "I suggest some name other than '*Guarantee Fund*,' which seems to exclude donors who have not *guaranteed* amounts."

Of course we like to have regular amounts guaranteed each month, or quarter, or year, as the case may be; this gives us something definite on which to depend, but on the other hand, we say here and now that ANY AMOUNT at ANY TIME is more than welcome.

Look at the Fund Total this month—£53 2s. 5d. only—barely more than half the £100 needed per month. A dangerous situation—doubly so when it is at this very time that we need extra money for the post-war plans of the L.M.

LABOUR MONTHLY is nearing its 25th Birthday. Twenty-five years with never a single issue missed, in spite of all handicaps. It is only through the generosity of our readers that this has been made possible: you have been our "Guarantee." Yet here we are, at long last on the threshold of a bigger and better L.M., which will cost far more to produce—and—less money in the Fund!

None of us are millionaires, but if every reader were to pay an extra sixpence for his LABOUR MONTHLY, we would make that £100 total five times over!

WILL YOU SEND US THAT ADDITIONAL SIXPENCE FOR A RECORD TOTAL NEXT MONTH?

	£	s.	d.
M. Milligan		3	0
R. Farrell	1	0	0
A. R. Trim		3	0
D. K. Pitt		1	6
K. M. G., Ex Rhodesia		2	6
H. E. Hodson	1	0	0
D. H. Strathern & Friends		8	0
S. Morrissy		10	0
F. W. Fenton		1	6
T. R. Macfarlane		12	0
P. N. Brinson		10	0
J. Macdonald		5	0
J. Sanford	6	12	0
C.P., San Francisco		5	0
R. D. Warnes		10	0
A. Wall		5	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
E. Widdowson		6	6
B. Lawson		13	0
O. Rutherford	1	0	0
Mr. & Mrs. Humphreys		2	6
J. Purton		10	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
H. Lowin	1	0	0
D. Gardner		2	0
F. Renouf		2	6
J. W. Turner		4	0
Anon		6	8
J. B.		5	0
J. H. Jury		7	0
D. Oakeshott		10	0

	£	s.	d.
Sapper Officer		10	0
J. M. Norman	1	0	0
Learner		2	0
A. Leonard		3	0
D. Rees		10	0
Director	2	0	0
L. Eker		10	0
S. Bruss		2	6
D. Goodfellow		4	0
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
V.A.D.		5	0
Cleveleys Cub Reporters		13	0
O. P. Hollander		10	0
L'Humanite		2	0
F. H. Bird		16	6
J. Pack		5	0
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
G. Miller		2	6
D. G. Martin		2	6
Eight of the Boys		10	0
Army Captain	1	0	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
H. B. Morton		3	0
C. Meldon		2	6
S. Fairston		2	6
S. Mill		10	0
M. Joffe		12	0
S. Saltman		10	0
The Bacon Family		5	0
H. A. B.	5	0	0

	£	s.	d.
E. Pratt		13	0
Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E.		10	0
C. Watson		4	0
Naval Officer		10	0
J. Edelsten	1	0	0
H. S. M.		2	6
E. Wilson		13	0
S. Morrissy		10	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
A. Berg		3	0
G. J. Leigh		8	0
W. Wallace		7	0
K. M. G., Ex Rhodesia		2	6
J. A. Smith		5	3
A. H. Maughan	1	0	0
V. R. Pearson		2	6
W. Maddison	1	0	0
Edinburgh East D.C.		12	0
R. Ashbolt		3	0
D. M. Adams		3	0
G. C. Havill		3	0
H. W. B. Hely		13	0
Office Worker		4	6
E. Connington		2	6
K. D. Matheson		5	0
A. Wall		5	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
V. Lloyd		2	0
R. N. Millar		2	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ready April 7th

WORLD LABOUR COMES OF AGE

Betty Wallace

Introduction by the Rt. Hon. George Isaacs, M.P.

A survey of the growth of the trade union movement throughout the world, culminating with the founding of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Cr. 8vo. *Fully Illustrated* *8s. 6d.*

LAWRENCE & WISHART

B.Sc. ECON.

Men and women who wish to prepare for post-war opportunities should obtain the London University B.Sc. Econ. degree. It is a valuable qualification not only for teaching or administrative posts under Education authorities, but also for statistical research and welfare work in commerce, industry, and T.U. organisation. The degree is open to all. Prepare for it at home under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall; tuition fees may be paid by instalments. At the 1945 (External) Exam. 36 out of 48 W. H. Students Passed, 21 in Honours.

Prospectus post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. JK17,

WOLSEY HALL, OXFORD

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY ?

by

WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

PRICE 3d.

(By post 4d.)

NOW ON SALE

Order from your bookshop or from

LABOUR MONTHLY,

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4, in the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED